

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to insert the limitations of claim 8, which has been considered allowable. Certain sections of claim 1 have been stricken as the limitations of claim 8 simply further define them. Thus, effectively, all of the limitations of claim 1 are included as well as those of claim 8. Claims 2-7 have been canceled as inconsistent with the incorporation of the limitations of claim 8.

As the incorporation of claim 8 does not alter the issues to be considered (claim 8 having been considered previously), entry of the amendment though made after final is believed proper.

Claim 14 has been amended for cosmetic purposes so that it does not appear to depend from two different claims. The text from claim 1 has just been inserted rather than referenced thereto. Claim 17 has been canceled as inconsistent with claim 1 as amended and claim 19 has been canceled as redundant.

The remaining claims remain the same.

As discussed below, applicants believe that the amendment to the claims places them in a position for allowance.

The following rejections are addressed formally:

The Art Rejections

Claims 1-7 and 10-16 were rejected as assertedly anticipated by WO01/09198 (WO '198). Claim 8 was not subject to this rejection. As the limitations of claim 8 have been placed into claim 1 and all other claims depend ultimately therefrom, this basis for rejection is obviated.

Claims 1-7, 10-13 and 15 were rejected as assertedly obvious over Neradovic, and claims 1-7 and 10-16 were rejected as obvious over Neradovic in view of U.S. 5,939,453. This rejection, too, was not applied to claim 8 and as the limitations of this claim are now in claim 1 this rejection is overcome as well.

Claims 17, 19 and 22-23 were rejected as anticipated by WO '198, as claim 1 on which these claims ultimately depend is now free of this rejection, it no longer applies.

Claims 20-21 were rejected as obvious over Neradovic, *et al.*, in view of U.S. 5,939,453 and this rejection, too, is no longer applicable to these claims in view of their dependence on claim 1.

Written Description

The rejection of claim 24 as failing to comply with the written description requirement is believed in error as the published PCT application, in claim 9, contains the range set forth therein. As the claim was amended by preliminary amendment, perhaps the presence of this possibility in the published application was overlooked.

Conclusion

In view of the amendment to claim 1, from which all other claims depend and the identification of support for claim 24, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 10-16, 18 and 21-25 are in a position for allowance and passage of these claims to issue is respectfully requested.

Should minor issues remain that could be resolved over the phone, a telephone call to the undersigned is respectfully requested.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any

required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket No. 313632002700.

Dated: August 23, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: _____ / Kate H. Murashige/ _____
Kate H. Murashige
Registration No.: 29,959
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92130-2040
Telephone: (858) 720-5112
Facsimile: (858) 720-5125